

## Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 22 have been amended. Claims 13 and 17-21 have been cancelled.

Therefore, claims 1-12, 14-16 and 22-29 are presented for examination.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-5, 9, 12, 14, 22 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Carr (U.S. Patent No. 5,293,379). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr.

Carr discloses a data processing system employing a compression method. See Carr at Abstract. The method includes reformatting each data packet by associating its static fields with a first packet region and its dynamic fields with a second packet region. The process then assembles a static table that includes static information from at least an initial data packet's first packet region. It then identifies static field information in a subsequent data packet's first packet region that is common to the information in the static table. Such common information is encoded so as to reduce its data length. The common static information is then replaced in the modified data packet with the encoded common static information and the modified data packet is then transmitted. A similar action occurs with respect to user-data information. A single dictionary table is created for all packet headers, while separate dictionary tables are created for each user-data portion of a packet-type experienced in the communication network thereby enabling better compression. *Id.*

Claim 1 recites identifying a first field and a second field within an electronic mail (email) message. Applicant submits that there is no disclosure in Carr of identifying fields within an email message. Carr discloses identifying static field information within data packets. Applicant submits that identifying fields within a data packet is not equivalent to identifying a field within an email message. Therefore claim 1 is patentable over Carr.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Therefore, claims 2-8 are also patentable over Carr.

Claim 9 recites generating a first code word table containing code words for a plurality of character strings found in a first electronic mail (email) message field, and generating a second code word table containing code words for a plurality of character strings found in a second email message field. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 9 is also patentable over Carr. Because claims 10-12 and 14-16 depend from claim 9 and include additional limitations, claims 10-12 and 14-16 are also patentable over Carr.

Claim 22 recites identifying a first field and a second field within an electronic mail (email) message. Therefore, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 22 is also patentable over Carr. Since claims 23-29 depend from claim 22 and include additional limitations, claims 23-29 are also patentable over Carr.

Claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Unger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,713). In addition, claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger et al. as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Ackley (U.S. Patent No. 6,422,476). Applicant submits that the rejection has been obviated by the cancellation of claims 17-21.

Claims 2-3, 10-11, 16, and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr as applied to Claims 1, 9, and 22, and further in view of Unger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,713). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr even in view of Unger.

Unger discloses a method for compressing text including parsing words from text in an input file and comparing the parsed words to a predetermined dictionary. The dictionary has a plurality of vocabulary words in it and numbers or tokens corresponding to each vocabulary word. A further step is determining which of the parsed words are not present in the predetermined dictionary and creating at least one supplemental dictionary including the parsed words that are not present in the predetermined dictionary. The predetermined dictionary and the supplemental dictionary are stored together in a compressed file. Also, the Docket No. 005545.P002  
Application No. 09/902,515

parsed words are replaced with numbers or tokens corresponding to the numbers assigned in the predetermined and supplemental dictionary and the numbers or tokens are stored in the compressed file. See Unger at Abstract.

Nevertheless, Unger does not disclose or suggest identifying a first field and a second field within an email message. As discussed above, Carr does not disclose or suggest such a limitation. Therefore, any combination of Carr and Unger would also not disclose or suggest identifying a first field and a second field within an email message. Accordingly, the present claims are patentable over Carr in view of Unger.

Claims 6-8, 15, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Unger as discussed above, and further in view of Ackley (U.S. Patent No. 6,422,476). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr and Unger even in view of Ackley.

Ackley discloses that a method, apparatus and computer-readable character set encodes a string of n-bit character codes corresponding to the data characters from an n-bit set of data characters in a data carrier as a string of m-bit character codes, where m is less than n. See Ackley at Abstract

However, Ackley does not disclose or suggest identifying a first field and a second field within an email message. As discussed above, neither Carr nor Unger disclose or suggest such a limitation. Therefore, any combination of Carr, Unger and Ackley would also not disclose or suggest identifying a first field and a second field within an email message. Accordingly, the present claims are patentable over Carr in view of Unger and further in view of Ackley.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr as applied to Claim 12, and further in view of Avital (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0129125). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr even in view of Avital.

Avital discloses a network connection platform that receives a transaction from a remote device. In response to the transaction, the network connection platform generates a transaction request that causes at least one or more applications to run on a computing device. The network connection platform retrieves data from at least one application and transmits the data to the remote device. See Avital at Abstract

Nonetheless, Avital does not disclose or suggest identifying a first field and a second field within an email message. As discussed above, Carr does not disclose or suggest identifying a first field and a second field within an email message. Therefore, any combination of Carr and Unger would also not disclose or suggest such a limitation. Accordingly, the present claims are patentable over Carr in view of Avital.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 30, 2003

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark L. Watson  
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(303) 740-1980